

STIGMATA

NUMBER TWO

MARCH 1978

Project Stigma represents an on-going probe into the relentless wave of animal mutilations and mutilation-deaths, and is an attempt to coordinate and assist in information-gathering activities on the part of the pertinent and responsible investigative agencies and individuals.

STIGMATA # 3 is scheduled for publication no later than May 1, 1978. To receive a copy, send a self-addressed, no. 10, stamped (13¢) envelope (SASE) to:
PROJECT STIGMA - P.O. Box 1094
PARIS, TEXAS 75460

STIGMATA will hopefully be utilized as a forum by the readership. Communication among those seeking answers is imperative. Space limitations may prevent us from publishing everything we receive, but we do heartily solicit your comments and welcome your observations. If you wish us to keep your name and/or address in confidence, please advise. We are continually seeking raw data, so if you have information to offer, we hope to hear from you. We do not believe in asking you for material if we cannot offer something in return. If you are interested in establishing a data exchange, contact us and we'll work something out.

Project Stigma has available a one-page animal mutilation report form, which has served to consolidate data and to supplement law enforcement reports and the like. To obtain 3 copies of this form, send a SASE (as above, 13¢ stamp) to the address above. If you have a mutilation report, we would encourage the readership to use this rudimentary form.

THE CATTLE REPORT is the first publication to be devoted entirely to the mutilations investigation. The subscription rate for 5 issues is \$6.00 or \$750 for Federal Intelligence Agencies. THE CATTLE REPORT is edited by renowned poet, Fug and Manson chronicler Edward Sanders and is available from:

THE CATTLE REPORT
P.O. Box 729
Woodstock, N. Y. 12498

STIGMATA • Copyright 1978 by
Thomas R. Adams

EDITORIAL:

IS THERE A "LINK" BETWEEN MUTILATIONS AND UFOs?

As we stated in STIGMATA #1, we have no "pet theories to promote. We are awaiting conclusive data (or at least reasonably compelling data).

We are open to virtually any and all possibilities regarding mute-causation. If for no other reason, there is the following to consider: it is our opinion that the perpetrators of the mutilations are accomplished and adroit enough at what they are doing that they possess a high capability for deception; that they can make us believe just about anything about them. So, to jump to unwarranted conclusions about the nature of the phenomena and the rationale of the mutilators could merely be "playing into their hands". With Mr. Spock's indulgence, there is no law against speculation, and it can even prove profitable, but let us allow the evidence to draw its own conclusions - eventually.

Since the mutilation death of Snippy the Horse in Colorado in 1967, a relationship between UFOs and the occurrence of mutilations has been postulated, however haphazardly. It can be said that, indeed, UFOs have been reported in or near areas where animal mutilations have occurred, and on some occasions at the same time. What does this mean, if anything? Can we be justified in considering that UFOs may be directly involved in the mutes or is this being a bit presumptuous? Well, as we shall consider below, it occurs that others may already have preceded us in presumption.

An examination of the particular and very pertinent mute incidents will not be ignored; but it is felt, at the outset, that we should scrutinize the philosophy of our methodology. We therefore address ourselves to what we feel is a case-in-point: the question of a UFO/mute relationship. We direct the reader to a "guest editorial" in the July 1976 issue of the newsstand publication OFFICIAL UFO (Countrywide Publications, Inc.; 257 Park Avenue South; New York, N.Y. 10010). At that time, OFFICIAL UFO was a reasonably respected magazine which represented a more-or-less sober and factual approach to the popularization of the UFO enigma.

(Continued on Page 2)

EDITORIAL

Although it has received considerable justified criticism since then, in 1976, under the editorial leadership of Bernard O'Connor, OFFICIAL UFO exemplified, while not necessarily scholarship, at least sincerity.

The author of the editorial is Kevin Randle, a writer and field investigator for the respected Tucson-based Aerial Phenomena Research Organization. Mr. Randle writes that he has "seen no evidence that links UFOs to cattle mutilations" and he sees "no reason to make the connection". He additionally feels that the "burden of proof" is not on those saying there is no such connection, "but on those claiming the link".

Why must there even be a "burden of proof"? If we cannot at a given moment say that we have conclusive proof that UFOs (or the occupants thereof) are responsible for mutilating animals, does some kind of automatic quantum leap in logic justify the assumption that UFOs are *not* involved in the mutilation of animals? If I cannot, at present, prove that there is a definite and incontrovertible "link" between UFOs and the mutilations, does this require a statement to the effect that this link, therefore, does not exist?

Mr. Randle proceeds in his argument to recognize that "there is no conclusive proof that UFOs are extraterrestrial spacecraft". This is convenient to know, and it may or may not be true, but the notion seems somehow irrelevant to the central question of the editorial (not to mention *this* editorial).

It is assuredly untrue that "each objective investigation has destroyed the link to UFOs". Many cases which have been examined through unjaundiced objective analysis exhibit data which at least leaves open the *possibility* that UFOs or some element of "The Paranormal" is involved. And, after all, we can advocate little more than a recognition of possibilities ("Think of everything, and believe nothing").

Mr. Randle relates the occurrence of an incident in which the mutilation of a bovine involved the cutting or removal of only an "ear and part of a lip". After indicating that UFOs which were reported relevant to the case "were Jupiter", he then concludes that "there were no UFOs and no mutilation."

A mutilation is a mutilation is a mutilation. If the above animal was truly mutilated by other than "natural" means, the fact that no more than the lips and an ear were affected does not necessarily invalidate the extramundane legitimacy of the incident. While many animals have suffered gross excision of sexual organs, excretory organs, tails, udders and other parts, in other incidents only one or two parts or organs have been violated, such as one or both ears, the tongue or lips.

We would agree with Mr. Randle in that settling on a conclusion or even on some less-than-conclusive hypothesis and seeking data and molding findings (however unconsciously) to "fit" the preconceived supposition is not conducive to a valid objective examination. It is not required that we should now decide whether UFOs and mutilations are somehow connected. What *is* required by prudent reasoning is that we gather data and truly objectively analyze and examine the information, realizing that any perfect or "absolute" objectivity is likely out of reach. With any luck at all, the evidence will eventually warrant conclusions.

Additionally, we can find agreement with Mr. Randle's assertion that the presence of UFOs near mutilation sites does not in itself prove there is a "link". Surely, then, he would also concede that it also does not negate this link. And, even if there is such a relationship, we cannot now know if it is direct or indirect.

It should be noted that there is ample evidence to indicate that humans have conducted *some* mutilations, both of animals and of people. It should also not be necessary to mention that this fact does not preclude other-than-human involvement in *other* mutilations.

(Continued on Page 3)

EDITORIAL continued

In a workshop session at a national and independent UFO conference in Fort Smith, Arkansas in October 1975, Mr. Randle supposed that an occult or pseudo-Satanic organization caused the few mutilations which he accepted as valid or authentically non-natural. He was also of the opinion that they at times utilized a helicopter. Regardless of the seeming improbability that any "cult" has the means, facilities, finances, personnel and organization to perpetrate this virtual crime-of-the-century, there have been accounts of *many* of the renowned "mystery helicopters" *at one time* in some mutilation-infested areas.

Some will likely consider our ideas here to be wishy-washy and uncertain. We, of course, prefer to think of our approach as judiciously objective. There are those, then, who would consider Mr. Randle to be merely "opinionated"; others might think his position unreasonable or, again, presumptuous. We have not intended this as a personal diatribe against Mr. Randle; but we do oppose his publicly-stated convictions as regards the animal mutilations, a realm for which we do not claim to lack strong feelings.

Some investigators who have probed deeply enough into the mutilations have noted that there would appear to be - by accident or design - a bizarre and at times almost synchronistic aura, a sometimes unsettling paranormal quality which seems to linger at the periphery of the mutilations phenomenon - or is it at its core?

Is it "saucers, satanists, or CIA?": All have received accusing glances as the mutilations investigation has proceeded. The "answers" may lie with any of these - or with all - or with none. There is a subtle complexity which prohibits the mutilation phenomenon from being as simple as some observers would have us believe.

The point to be made from this critique of Mr. Randle's assertions is that it is still possible that there may indeed be some sort of UFO/mute link, however direct or indirect. The question simply cannot be resolved with the current lack of definitive "evidence". It also occurs to us that, while we're at it, it would be nice to know just what UFOs are, as though this entire affair

needed further complication. We will reiterate that we do not necessarily "believe" in the UFO/mute link. Belief, after all, seems irrelevant. Data is of preeminent priority.

We would be remiss if we were not to mention our gratitude to those who responded to our first issue by sending a self-stamped envelope. We appreciate your interest and are encouraged by it. A very special thanks is extended to those who contributed stamps and cash to further alleviate expenses.

We promised in STIGMATA # 1 to make necessary corrections or additions to our 1977 mutilation chronology. Three cases to be added are as follows:

June 1977 - McPherson County, Kansas

December 1977 - Approximately December 20th, Jackson County, Missouri

December 1977 - Salt Lake County, Utah.
Horse, discovered 12-28-77, Salt Lake City

We ask readers to advise of further additions.

AGREED: SOMEONE IS OPERATING UNDER A DELUSION

We once hoped that sociologists and social psychologists would examine the mutilations and its effect on the populace from their professional perspective. Now we're beginning to wonder if that's such a great idea. An interesting if inherently faulted paper (20 pp.) has been authored by Mr. James R. Stewart; Dept. of Sociology; University of South Dakota; Vermillion, S.D. 57069. The paper is titled CATTLE MUTILATIONS: AN EPISODE OF COLLECTIVE DELUSION and it may still be available from Mr. Stewart. You might send him five 13¢ stamps to cover his postage costs.

It should be noted that the pages of STIGMATA will not be enthusiastically open to debate on the question of whether there actually are any "classic", unnatural animal mutilations occurring. Our primary thrust will be toward determining who (or what), how and why.

MUTE TESTIMONY:

"Our predators do not eat with a knife and fork".

Sheriff Marvin Quade; Lawrence County, Missouri; speaking of his conviction that the mutilations in his county had been done with knives. Source: Buffalo (Mo.) Reflex, 11-6-75.

"...I've got to say we're stumped. It's a real mystery".

Sheriff Marvin Quade again. Source: St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 10-22-75.

"I've been around cattle all my life and I can sure tell whether it's been done by a coyote or a sharp instrument";

Sheriff George Yarnell, Elbert County, Colorado. Source: Kansas City Times, 10-31-75.

"...it was such an isolated remote area that it almost had to be someone that knew the terrain. I didn't go out the same way that I came in because I wasn't sure of the area ...humans make mistakes. So far whoever is doing this (mutilations) hasn't made any".

Sheriff Floyd Stahr; Deuel County, Neb. Source: Julesburg Advocate (Colo.) 9-17-75.

"...if it's a coyote, then he has to be carrying a very sharp knife".

Sheriff Anton Nowak; Perkins County, Neb. Source: Lincoln Journal (Neb.) 10-11-75.

It has been alleged that no one, no "mere mortal", has witnessed an actual mutilation occurring or has stumbled onto a site to interrupt the work-in-progress. This may yet be true; but mute-site encounters of various degrees have been reported, and the elusive mystery helicopters, it is said, have been chanced-upon by more than one unwary private citizen.

The problem is that there seems to be little or no firm substantiation or documentation to support these stories, some of which are among the more bizarre - and potentially important - accounts in this field of investigation. Further examination of some of these incidents is underway, however, and it will be our intention to report upon these in more detail in an upcoming STIGMATA.

We are interested in information concerning animal mutilation incidents in which unusual odors have been detected at the mute site, other than that normally associated with decomposition.

For instance, in 1975, Deputy David Ellis encountered an aroma at a site in Gunnison County, Colorado which reminded him of a combination of formaldehyde and incense.

Sometime during the first half of 1977 in Taos County, N.M., an insurance claim was paid to a rancher for the mutilation death of a cow- a "standard" mutilation, except for one peculiarity: within a period of 24 hours or less of the cow's death, the carcass changed color, from a reddish-brown to a cream or dirty-white color.

For years, ranchers in Karnes County, Texas have been plagued by an affliction apparently related to the mining of uranium in the area. The element molybdenum is brought to the surface by the uranium miners and nearby cattle sometimes suffer from molybdenosis or "moly poisoning", a characteristic of which is a change in color preceding an almost certain death. The cattle are known to change to a "dirty white" or "smoky gray" color. Unlike the New Mexico case, the Texas cattle change color *before* death.

Two mutilations were reported in the moly-infested area of Karnes County in 1975, but neither animal exhibited a color change.

Curiously, a large "MolyCorp" molybdenum mine is located in the northern reaches of Taos County, New Mexico. We cannot claim a "connection" here, but we would appreciate hearing from readers who have knowledge of color changes in mutilated animals.

To decompose or not to decompose... a dilemma that has apparently troubled a great many mutilated animal carcasses. The results are varied. It has been stated that mute carcasses decompose very little or very slowly in some cases, but in others the situation may be reversed. We will offer specific examples in our next issue.